..ARY ... MAY 1956 ... LEGISLATURE, MADRAS

THE MADRAS LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY.

Saturday, 28th January 1956.

The House met in the Assembly Chamber, Government Estate, Mount Road, at nine of the clock, Mr. Speaker (THE HON. SRI N. GOPALA MENON) in the Chair.

I.—QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS.

STARRED QUESTION.

Central College of Karnatic Music, Adyar

* 3038 *Q.*—SRI N. K. PALANISAMY: Will the Hon. the Minister for Finance be pleased to state—

(*a*) the amount spent on the Central College of Karnatic Music, Adyar, in 1954;

(*b*) whether any grant is made by the Central Government to this College;

(*c*) if so, how much; and

(*d*) the number of people graduated from the college during 1954?

THE HON. SRI C. SUBRAMANIAM: (*a*) The amount spent on the Central College of Karnatic Music is Rs. 45,965 during the financial year 1953–54 and Rs. 44,584 during 1954–55.

(*b*) & (*c*) Ever since the inception of the college in 1949, the college was getting financial assistance from the Government of India at the rate of half the expenditure on the college subject to a maximum of Rs. 25,000 per annum. The Government of India while sanctioning the grant for 1953–54 have expressed their inability to continue the monetary contribution to the college and have suggested to this Government to approach the Sangeet Natak Akadami for financial assistance. The Sangeet Natak Akadami has since been addressed for a grant in the matter.

(*d*) Thirteen.

[*Note.*—An asterisk (*) at the commencement of a speech indicates revision by the Member.]

II.—SUSPENSION OF MEMBER FROM THE SITTING FOR THE DAY (SRI K. VINAYAKAM).

MR. SPEAKER: Order, order. Before proceeding with this question and allowing supplementary questions to be put, I want to remind hon. Members that, yesterday after some discussion regarding the adjournment motion given by hon. Member Sri K. Vinayakam when I wanted to proceed to the next item of the business on the agenda, the hon. Member persisted in standing while I was addressing the House and in spite of my repeated

requests to resume his seat, he said : "I refuse to sit down. As a protest I walk out." And, he actually walked out of the House. The Hon. the Leader of the House suggested that action should be taken against the hon. Member for disobedience to the Chair and that he should be expelled from the House at least for the day. At the suggestion of the Leaders of the Opposition groups I wanted that an opportunity should be given to the hon. Member to express his regret at his conduct.

According to rule 63, at any time if the Speaker rises, any Member speaking shall resume his seat. So, when I was on my legs, the hon. Member persisted in standing and speaking and when he was called to order he protested and walked out.

Under Rule 62, clause (vi), no Member shall leave the House when the Speaker is addressing the House.

In May's Parliamentary Practice, it is stated as follows:

"Whenever the Speaker rises to interpose in the course of a debate, he is to be heard in silence, and any Member who is speaking or offering to speak should immediately sit down; nor should Members leave their seats while the Speaker is addressing the House; and Members who do not maintain silence, or who attempt to address the Speaker, are called to order by the majority of the House with loud cries of 'Order' and 'Chair'. A Member who persists in standing after the Speaker has risen and refuses to resume his seat when directed by the Chair to do so may be either directed to withdraw from the House for the remainder of the sitting or named for disregarding the authority of the Chair."

9-10 a.m. In describing the position and functions of the Speaker of the House of Commons, "May" observes as follows:

"The Speaker of the House of Commons is the representative of the House itself in its powers, proceedings and dignity. His functions fall into two main categories. On the one hand he is the mouth or representative of the House in its relations with the Crown, the House of Lords and other authorities and persons outside Parliament. On the otherhand he presides over the debates of the House of Commons and enforces the observance of all rules for preserving order in its proceedings . . . The chief characteristics attaching to the office of Speaker in the House of Commons are authority and impartiality . . . When he rises to preserve order or to give a ruling on a doubtful point he must always be heard in silence and no member may stand when the Speaker is on his feet. Reflection upon the character or actions of the Speaker may be punished as breaches of privilege. His action cannot be criticized incidentally in debate or upon any form of proceedings except a substantive motion."

Yesterday when the hon. Member, Sri Vinayakam had walked out, it was the desire of the House that he should be given an opportunity to express his regret to the House. In these matters it must be realized that the Speaker has no existence apart from that of the House and anything done in

28th January 1956] [Mr. Speaker]

derogation to the authority of the Speaker is a disregard or disrespect to the House itself. I consider that the action of the hon. Member Sri Vinayakam is a disrespect to the Chair and therefore to the House and that he would come under Rule 85 of the Assembly Rules. As he did not come again to the House yesterday, I could not mention it yesterday. But if I proceeded with the business of the day, and if the hon. Member Sri Vinayakam participated in the further proceedings of the House, it may be regarded that his case had been condoned. I therefore took the earliest opportunity of raising this matter and it is the wish of the House and also of mine that the hon. Member should express his regret at what had happened yesterday.

SRI S. SWAYAMPRAKASAM : On a point of order, Sir. Apart from the subject-matter on which the chair has spoken, I would like to invite your attention, Sir, to Rule 22 of the Assembly Rules which says :

"The first hour of every sitting shall, unless the House unanimously resolves otherwise, be available for the asking and answering of questions."

Therefore unless the House gives its permission, no business other than putting and answering of questions could be transacted during question hour. Here in this case, the House has not given permission and permission has not been sought to discuss some other subject during question-hour. As a matter of fact questions have been asked and when we were proceeding with one question, this matter had been taken up. According to Rule 22, it would be wrong to take up this matter during question-hour. Only after the question-hour is over, this matter could be taken up.

THE HON. SRI C. SUBRAMANIAM : It would be wrong to construe like that. Then that means anybody could misbehave during question-hour and that we could not deal with the same. This is a question of paramount importance and relates to a question of misbehaviour by a Member and it cannot be said that putting and answering of questions alone could be done during question-hour and that we could not deal with the question of misbehaviour by a Member during question-hour. Then it means anybody could misbehave during question-hour. I am afraid it is a wrong procedure. Since this matter relates to the conduct of a Member and it relates to the dignity of the House, I think it has got precedence over everything else as it comes under Rule 85 of the Assembly Rules.

* SRI P. RANGASWAMI REDDIAR : On a point of order, Sir. It is only yesterday you were pleased to point out that it is we who framed the rules and we were going by these rules. I wish to know from you, Sir, under what rule of the Assembly Rules we are now governed and this matter is now taken up. Rule 85 has no application to the present occasion—to what happened yesterday. Yesterday you did not ask the Member to withdraw. I do not know what exactly is reported in the official proceedings. My submission is that the matter is closed.

[28th January 1956

MR. SPEAKER : I have made it perfectly clear that it is not a matter which is in the order of business to-day. This relates to an incident which happened yesterday. We expected that the hon. Member Sri Vinayakam would come back to the Assembly yesterday because it was, I think, the desire of the House that he should be given an opportunity to express regret. He did not turn up yesterday and now a little after the beginning of question-hour he has come up. If I allowed questions and supplementaries to be taken up, it would amount to a condonation of the act committed by the hon. Member Sri Vinayakam. There are instances and precedents to show that if an offending Member had been allowed to participate in the discussion of the proceedings of the House, the matter could not be brought up again after he had already participated in the discussions, because allowing him to participate in the proceedings of the House would amount to a condonation of his misbehaviour. Therefore it is that I did not allow even supplementaries to be put, and as soon as the hon. Member took his seat, I took up this point. I think the matter is perfectly clear and he may do so, if the hon. Member has got to say anything.

* SRI K. VINAYAKAM : Mr. Speaker, Sir, after I withdrew from this House yesterday, I did not know what transpired here afterwards. I read from the papers that the Hon. Leader of the House wanted to move a resolution requesting you to expel me from the House for the day. It all happened yesterday. If I had come again yesterday, that motion could be binding on me or even stand. But I had come only today. What happened yesterday does not stand the test of logic to-day and, Sir, after I have thought about it I feel, that there is no necessity for me to express any regret or apologise on this issue, for I never meant any insult or misbehaviour either to the Chair or to the House. I felt that I must have been given an opportunity to explain the matter on a point of personal explanation. It is a rudimentary principle of any parliamentary procedure to give a Member an opportunity to explain on any motion. When I was denied that right I thought my privileges had been curtailed. So I believe that there is no necessity for any expression of apology.

MR. SPEAKER : May I take it that the hon. Member refuses to express any regret regarding the incident that happened yesterday?

SRI K. VINAYAKAM : I have said the last word on this subject and I do not propose to add anything more to that.

THE HON. SRI C. SUBRAMANIAM : I am really sorry that the hon. Member should have adopted this attitude. After all, in the heat of the moment we are likely to commit mistakes. I do commit mistakes. I admit that I do commit mistakes. It is not derogatory to the self-respect of anybody, particularly when it relates to the conduct and dignity of the House, to express regret at what had been committed in the heat of the moment. Therefore I would request the hon. Member on behalf of the House and everybody here to express regret at what had

28th January 1956] [Sri C. Subramaniam]

happened yesterday. After all what had happened yesterday was not a dignified thing. Therefore he must feel sorry at what had happened and must express his regret. I am sorry he has not chosen to express his regret. If he does not express regret, we owe a duty to the House, and the Speaker should take necessary action so that the dignity of the House may be maintained.

* SRI K. VINAYAKAM : I am afraid the Hon. Leader of the House has simply aggravated the situation. I have said the last word on the subject. I never meant any insult either to the Chair or to the House. Where is the necessity for any expression of apology then?

MR. SPEAKER : In view of the further clarification by the hon. Member, I want to say this :

It may be that the hon. Member Sri Vinayakam did not mean anything. If he had done anything which is regarded as disrespect either to the House or to the Chair, it is only appropriate that he should express his regret.

There are very many people who do things unwittingly which are regarded as disrespect or may be taken as offence by others. 9-20 a.m. In this case, the House, as I take it, regard his conduct as disrespectful to the Chair and to the House and therefore, irrespective of what he considers about his own action, he must remember that he is a Member of this House and he must maintain the dignity, prestige and orderliness of this House. Therefore I would once again ask him if he would find his way to express his regret for what he has done.

(Sri Rangasamy Reddiar and Sri Daivasigamony rose . . .)

MR. SPEAKER : I want to say that this is not a matter which should be treated as a matter for discussion. I allowed discussion yesterday and now it is purely a matter between the House and the hon. Member Mr. Vinayakam.

(Dr. K. B. Menon rose . . .)

MR. SPEAKER : I do not think the hon. Member should discuss this matter.

SRI K. VINAYAKAM : Sir, I have already explained the position sufficiently well and if the Chair is not convinced of what I have said, I leave the whole matter to the Chair to take whatever attitude the Chair wants.

MR. SPEAKER : Not the Chair, but the House.

SRI V. BALAKRISHNAN : May I say a word?

MR. SPEAKER : I do not think there should be further discussion and further complications raised in this matter.

I am extremely sorry that the hon. Member Sri Vinayakam thinks that he did not do anything disrespectful to the House; I am also very sorry that I should now, in exercise of the authority of the Chair, direct that he do withdraw from the House for the remainder of the sitting this day.

[28th January 1956

SRI K. VINAYAKAM : If it is your pleasure, Sir, that I should withdraw from the House, it is equally my pleasure to withdraw.

(Sri Vinayakam collected his papers and withdrew from the House.)

MR. SPEAKER : We will now proceed with questions. Supplementaries to question No. 3038.

I.—QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS—*cont.*

SRI N. K. PALANISAMY : இந்த சென்ட்ரல் காலேஜிலேயே தனியாக ஓரியண்டல் டான்ஸ் கற்றுக்கொடுப்பதற்கு ஒரு வகுப்பு நடத்தும உத்தேசம் சர்க்காருக்கு இருக்கிறதா ? அப்படியானுல் என்ன நடவடிக்கை எடுத்திருக்கிறார்கள் ?

THE HON. SRI C. SUBRAMANIAM : ஓரியண்டல் டான்ஸிற்கு தனியாகப் பள்ளி வைக்காமல் இருந்தாலும் இந்தச் சமூகத்திலுள்ளவர்கள் அதில் மிகுந்த கவனம் செலுத்தி வருவதாகச் சிலர் கருதுகிறார்கள்.

SRI M. JAGANNATHAN : While it is gratifying to note that the Central College of Karnatic Music at Adyar is manufacturing graduates every year, may I know whether the Government have got any schemes by which they provide avenues of employment to these graduates?

THE HON. SRI C. SUBRAMANIAM : Yes, Sir. There is sufficient scope for the employment of music teachers in the various educational institutions.

SRI S. RAMALINGAM : பழைய கால கலையைக் காப்பாற்றுவதற்காகச் சர்க்கார் சிரத்தை எடுத்துக் கொள்ளும் முறையில் இதற்கு மேலும் உதவி செய்ய முன் வருவார்களா ?

THE HON. SRI C. SUBRAMANIAM : இந்தக் கல்லூரியையே, இன்னும் நல்ல முறையில் எப்படி நடத்துவது என்பதைப்பற்றி சர்க்கார் ஆலோசித்துக்கொண்டிருக்கிறார்கள். அவர்கள் முடிவு செய்த பிறகு சபையினருடைய ஆலோசனையையும் இது விஷயத்தில் சர்க்கார் கலந்துகொள்ளும்.

SRI M. PALANIYANDI : இந்தக் கல்லூரியில் படித்துப் பாஸ் செய்கின்ற மாணவ மாணவிகளுக்குப் பட்டம் வழங்குவதில் இருந்த தகராறு தீர்ந்துவிட்டதா ? மேலும் இப்பள்ளியில் சாஸ்திரியப் பாட்டுகள் தான் சொல்லி கொடுக்கப்பட்டு வருகின்றன. கிராமீயப் பாடல்களையும் கற்றுக் கொடுக்க இந்தக் கல்லூரிலேயே ஏற்பாடு செய்யப்படுமா என்று கேட்கிறேன் ?

THE HON. SRI C. SUBRAMANIAM : பட்டம் [கொடுப்பதில் இருந்த தகராறு என்ன என்பது எனக்குத் தெரியவில்லை. ஆகவே அதைப்பற்றி தனியாக ஒரு கேள்வி போட்டால் விடை அளிக்கிறேன். மேலும் இந்தக் கல்லூரிலேயே கிராமீயப் பாடல்களைக் கற்றுக் கொடுக்க வேண்டிய அவசியம் இல்லை என்று நான் நினைக்கிறேன். ஆகையால் சாஸ்த்தீரியப் பாடல்களைச் சொல்லி கொடுப்பதோடு நிறுத்திக்கொள்வது தான் நல்லது என்றும் அபிப்பிராயப்படுகிறேன்.

SRI C. KANDASAMY : மத்திய சர்க்கார் கொடுத்து வந்த மானியத்தை தொடர்ந்தும் இந்தக் கலையின் வளர்ச்சிக்காக ஏன் கொடுத்து வரக்கூடாது ? அப்படிக் கொடுத்து வர மாகாண சர்க்கார் மத்திய சர்க்காரை வற்புறுத்துமா ?